FINAL

SPRING VALLEY

Partnering Meeting
Federal Property
5201 Little Fall Road, Washington, DC

MEETING MINUTES

PURPOSE OF MEETING: Partnering Meeting

LOCATION: Federal Property

DATE: September 10, 2001

TIME: 10:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Action items are ***bolded and italicized***.

1. INTRODUCTIONS/REVIEW AGENDA

2. UPDATE:

2.1 OU-3 (4825 Test Pits Status of SDA/Stream Restoration)

4825 Glenbrook nothing new. Began excavation last Thursday. Encountered 8" waterline in excavation.

Rich Albright says that the pit was located on 4825 Glenbrook. Rich Albright stated that he has come across correspondence that states that the Corps knew that there were pits on 4825 Glenbrook. Lan Reeser stated that he knew of no evidence that there were pits on 4825. Glen Frano of TEC did the interpretation that determined that POI 24 was on 4801. Terry Sloneker stated that though he had established multiple locations for the pit(s), he felt he had located a pit close to Test Pit 23. However, he is lacking control to pin point the location. Maj Peloquin asked the team if at any time in the past did the Corps or its Contractors place POI 24 on 4825 Glenbrook. Rich's copy of a January 1998 Corps email discusses the location of the pit and its potential location outside 4801. Mr. Buckley stated that there were several revisions of where POI 24 was located but the 2nd and 3rd revisions had the locations on 4801 Glenbrook. Terry Slonecker stated that he used the bunkers to anchor his data. All that did was anchor the pit somewhere along the fence line. Mr. Albright wants the Corps to be more forthcoming about any potential pit locations on 4825 Glenbrook. Ken Shuster asked about past locations. Terry stated that the photogrammetry is more accurate than the terrestrial locating. The current Test Pit

23 is the fringe and the driveway where the bottles were dug is the other side of the fringe according to Rich Albright. Mr. Albright's concern is that there is evidence that the pit may be under the house or the front yard. Mr. Reeser restated that he knew of no evidence that previously suggested a pit was on 4825 Glenbrook. Referring to the TEC interpretation, Mr. Reeser said 4825 remained an (unlikely) potential location only because TEC's stated level of accuracy (within a 60-foot circle of error) extended onto 4825. Terry will assist in narrowing down the location of any burial pit locations using the Blackhawk technology. Ken Shuster would like the front yard and corners surveyed.

Terry Slonecker would like photos of Munitions. Sean Buckley will email Maj Peloquin photos.

Lan Reeser will produce letters with TEC regarding the placement of POI 24 to be given to Rich Albright. Lan will also produce any other correspondence regarding the placement of POI 24.

Stream restoration costs not finalized.

2.2 OU-4 (CDC remediation status and results for AU and private residences sampling)

Grid sampling at Metro Methodist Church scheduled for this week. One other property to grid sample after that.

CDC confirmation sampling detected 3550 mg/kg As at 5' at grid 140, 120. Some rubble was found at 1.5 feet that was modern construction debris. Construction debris was wallboard, some metal pipe on which American University was written, etc. Awaiting confirmation samples from under the sidewalk. Took confirmation samples Friday will get results around Tuesday or Wednesday. Sampled two sources of backfill for the full list. Preliminary data looks good except for a couple of hits. Depending on finalization of data should be acceptable for backfill.

Rich Albright mentioned that there is a ground scar over the CDC. He feels that the As is migrating. Chris Evans stated that the higher reading are closer to the 1918 surface where they would be expected. Buildings and outside storage of materials were located in this area of elevated arsenic readings.

Total carcinogenic PAHs have been below 12 mg/kg. Rich would like the full suite of parameters run on the confirmation samples to include ABPs. Maj. Peloquin felt that the data would not tell us anything. Drew Rak stated that if you remove the arsenic you would most likely remove all other source material.

Construction debris was wallboard and pipe, but was modern material. One glass bottle was found. If still available, it will be photographed and sent to Rich and Ken. The material was most likely already shipped to the approved landfill (all shipments and facilities are pre-approved prior to any excavation). Rich requested a copy of the shipping manifest.

Rich feels that the parents should be given all the data.

Rich stated that the EPA should withdraw the 1998 Risk Assessment. Frank Vavra stated that EPA would most likely not withdraw but would revise based on additional data. Rich feels that it should be withdrawn and redone. Corps feels that it would be hard to withdraw since it has been referenced so many times. Rich realizes that it would be hard but claims it was never accepted by DC Health and so is not a final document for the Administrative Record.

Adjacent grids have been sampled. EPA is interested in knowing whether or not there is arsenic concentration at depth in the adjacent grids and that it could be missed because no samples have been taken at depth. COE agrees with multiple sidewall samples for grids excavated greater than 2 feet to address this concern.

Pete Crowley asked when the work will begin on Lot 12 and the intramural ball fields? Maj. Peloquin's reply was next fiscal year. No timeline available but the target is sometime around the end of the year or the 1st of the year.

Rich asked about the high hit north of the CDC, which would be addressed during the Lot 12 removal.

Anecdotal evidence of bunker like structures on AU Property near the football stadium. Reportedly these structures contained drums. Rich would like that investigated.

The group discussed the prioritization of Lot 12 remediation instead of the ball field/intramural fields. If this is the case we will need to start working on the remediation work plans soon. Work plans should include not only Lot 12 but also the remaining AU lots that require remediation.

DC will require that the anomalies at 5054 and 5058 Sedgwick be intrusively investigated.

Mark Baker to assist in determining what buildings and storage areas were located where the high readings are now located at the CDC.

Pete Crowley will verify what debris was encountered and if there are any photos.

When excavations extend beyond two feet multiple sidewall samples will be collected.

Begin work plan for lot 12 and ball fields.

Rich Albright requested copies of the shipping manifests for the materials excavated from the CDC.

2.3 OU-5 (Sedgwick Trench and Comprehensive sampling status)

2.3.1 CSA

OU-5 update. Through last week we sampled 826 sites including private residence and ½ acre lots. Approximately 10-15% of the 826 have surface arsenic exceedances (greater than 12.6 ppm). At the end of August, the first sampling increment was finished. The remaining sites are those sites where the ROEs trickle in or grid sampling where the exceedances occurred. Right

now approx. 90 sites require grid sampling. The highest reading to date was 158 mg/kg. ROEs for approximately 74% of the total sites have been obtained.

Letters for 57 "specialty" sampling sites were ready to be sent to homeowners. All parameters other than arsenic were non-detect.

Have all the ground scars been located to determine if they were former POI locations? Terry has not completed that analysis.

Outside the CTA the objective is borings at 15% of the properties. Is it OK to make up for sites where no ROE can be obtained by using adjacent sites with same ground scars, etc.? Parsons to provide these alternate locations. Suggestion was to place some of these borings in the properties already determined to get grid sampling.

Rich Albright suggested more samples at depth in the grid properties. Mike Peloquin suggested for CSA properties with composite results >43 ppm arsenic, move a boring from a non-ROE property to that property (in that half). If the half is <43 ppm take one additional 12"grid sample in that half for arsenic. This is a discrete sample collected at 12 inches for arsenic only. DC Health, EPA, and the Corps agreed to this.

2.3.2 Sedgwick Trench

Maj Peloquin reported on grid sampling results. Three properties were elevated (3720 Fordham resident denied access). 5054 Sedgwick Road, grid sampling most detects were in the single digits even though the quadrant sampling detected 85 mg/kg. Nothing detected on top of anomaly in the front yard.

3. REMEDIATION LEVELS FOR AU AND SPRING VALLEY

Based on the special circumstances of the CDC, the removal action level is lower there. The 41.4 ppm criterion was decreased to 26 ppm below 2 feet. Rich Albright wants concentrations reduced to "urban background". Rich mentions DC policy does not incorporate risk-based criteria. Mike Peloquin said the COE lawyers were researching that issue.

COE risk based criteria comes up with >43 as outside the acceptable risk range. If there is a concentration outside the risk range then remove to match background. If within the risk range then remove all >43.

Residents are concerned with health issues but others are concerned that the number is too low.

USEPA uses 43 as a 10^{-4} risk number for removal actions, not for the development of remediation levels in an RI/FS. The NCP requires that all remedial goals try to achieve a risk level of 10^{-6}. However, 10-6 is not always practicable or economic. Arsenic is usually based on background levels, not risk, because risk numbers are so low.

Two key issues discussed were: when do we remediate and to what do we remediate to? The COE tends to use risk as a trigger while AU and D.C. tend to use background numbers. USEPA

is concerned that people will be getting different cleanup levels. However, the goal is equal protection or equal reduction in risk.

DC Government Position - DC says that we are not doing risk-based remediation we must cleanup to background or to the level that BAT can achieve. DC Health is suggesting between 17 and 20 ppm arsenic being the high-end concentration of Urban Background at 0-2' for each grid. Below 2' it would be based on a site-by-site basis. DC feels that 26 is a safer construction worker standard for greater than 2 feet.

Currently the Corps is using 41.4 ppm instead of 26 ppm for screening the boring data below 2'.

In the next two weeks the Corps will have a decision as to whether or not to pursue risk or background based cleanup.

Parsons to do a scrub for all hits above 26 ppm and below 41.4 ppm for the borings.

4. ADMINISTRATION OF THE CLEANUP PROCESS

A presumptive feasibility study that would still work with individual homeowner was discussed. Still looking at whether it is legally feasible.

How do we administratively execute the cleanup process without dragging it out. USEPA does not know whether the ROD process would be too cumbersome. Considerations for the presumptive remedy (feasibility study) would be look at all the technologies in general without selecting a remedy. Then prepare a proposed plan with that would be a decision tree or flow chart based on the FS. Look at the proposed plan and then allow individual homeowners to comment on the plan. Instead take individual comments during the design of the plan. Following public comment on the proposed plan, submit a ROD.

Other suggestions:

More cumbersome but let individual homeowners comment and try address all comments in one complex ROD

Use a removal process and No Further Action ROD at the end instead of FS and ROD prior to cleanup.

An EE/CA would not include results but would define action levels and the cleanup standards. Use one ROD for all properties that do not require remediation. However, the community might want a buy in prior to the final ROD. Question is where would all the results be presented in a formal document for the record if a generic EE/CA is used?

5. GEOPHYSICS

Prove-Out Plan and Schedule has been sent. EODT will be onsite next week to scope out the site. All were shipped to Baltimore. Will look at detecting jugs. List the properties. The target

objective is to look for pits and trenches. DC wants impact areas and areas of individual duds looked at in terms of single items. But only in areas where evidence suggests there may be the potential. The new technology will be proven up here. Blackhawk (EODT sub) will be given the opportunity to try any technology they want. Can AETC look at the old data and the response? No, because the raw data is not available. DC has just passed their munitions rule.

October RAB meeting will be the venue for a formal geophysics presentation to educate the community. This will include how future areas are to be investigated. Also include a generic description of how geophysical investigation sites (ground scars) are selected and prioritized.

Have not defined level of effort, equipment to use, how will data be interpreted.

Huntsville needs a final list of properties prior to the start of the prove out survey work. The final list is 5046, 5065, 5058 Sedgwick, 4710 Woodway, 4835 Glenbrook, 3 AU Lots (Lots 11, 14, 17 to SDA.

DC Health needs to summarize their position and clearly define the scope of their position regarding geophysical investigation objective, i.e., pits/trenches or single item anomlaies. This will result in a request to be taken forward to COE Leadership.

Need to finalize agenda and people responsible for the agenda items for October 11 RAB meeting. Ed Bishop to present on the 1993/95 geophysics.

Plan a meeting for late November/December (when the final EODT report and feature prioritization are completed) to develop the process for: feature investigation; technologies to be used; data interpretation; and decision-making.

6. AIR MONITORING PLAN

Maj Peloquin reviewed the air monitoring plan. Ed Bishop of Parsons joined by phone. Mr. Albright had concerns with Air Monitoring Plan including air intake levels which Ed Addressed. Mr. Albright wants 24 hours but the methods are only validated for 8 hours so even if you wanted to run 24 hours you would need to change out every 8 hours. Why not a bubbler? Bubbler uses acids, typically. We are using NIOSH Approved methods instead of acid. 4825 Glenbrook will be air sampled after the sediment is removed from the basement but prior to restoration.

Ed Bishop to calculate mustard detection limit for method used.

7. OTHER ISSUES

Working through right-to-know vs. privacy rights for data presentation. CENAB said it would be OK to present results associated with an address but not a name.

ROE refusals: DC will not exercise their right to come on site and take samples unless there are obvious circumstances and potential health impacts for off-site receptors, i.e., potential risk to neighbors.

Comfort letter: Frank Vavra to get example to Mike Peloquin.

8. ACTION ITEMS/TIMELINES

The RAB co-chair Sarah Shapley would like two timelines, one for health study and one soil remediation. Any health survey is linked to sampling.

Name	Organization/Address
Tom Bachovchin	Parsons ES
Sean Buckley	Parsons ES
Pete Crowley	Parsons ES
Mike Rogers	CENAB
Major Mike Peloquin	CENAB
Lan Resser	CENAB
Chris Evans	CENAB
Drew Rak	CENAB
Mark Baker	CENAB
Richard Albright	DCEHA
Frank Vavra	USEPA
Sherry Anderson-Hudgins	USAESCH
Jorge Abud	AU
Terry Slonecker	USEPA
Ken Shuster	USEPA
Kelli Williams	USAESCH
Kevin Brennan	CENAB
Jim Baron	CENAB
Ted Henry	CENAB